

**B. Remarks**

1. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-19 and 26-44 are pending in the application. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,864,180 (“Barraclough”). Claims 4-6, 13-16, 19, 26-35, 39, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barraclough. Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barraclough in view of Japanese Publication No. 03-221922 (“Hatano”) or vice versa. Claims 34-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The examiner has objected to claims 7-12, 17-18, and 44 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants hereby amend claims 1, 13, and 18. Applicants hereby add new claim 45 to more fully define the invention.

2. The Rejection of Claim 1 Has Been Overcome

Applicants hereby amend claim 1 to recite a method for fabricating an electrical circuit, comprising the steps, among others, of depositing a layer of a first conductive material onto a surface of a flexible substrate, wherein at least a portion of the substrate is translucent or transparent. Applicants respectfully submit that Barraclough does not disclose this combination of features. As such, Barraclough does not anticipate claim 1, as amended, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground for rejection. Because claims 2-14, 26-31 and 45 depend from claim 1, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable, as well. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of those claims, as well.

3. Claims 15-18, 32-34 And 44 Are Patentable Over Barraclough

Each of these claims recites, either explicitly or through dependency, the steps of “depositing a layer of a first conductive material onto a surface of a substrate; depositing a layer of a second conductive material onto said layer of a first conductive material; *selectively etching a first portion of said layer of a second conductive material and a portion of said layer of first conductive material*; and selectively etching a second portion of said layer of a second conductive material” (emphasis added). The examiner has taken the position that Barraclough teaches or renders obvious this combination of process steps. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse this basis for rejection at least on the ground that Barraclough does not teach the step set forth in italics, namely, the step of “selectively etching a first portion of said layer of a second conductive material and a portion of said layer of first conductive material.”

To the extent Barraclough teaches etching a portion of a layer of first conductive material and etching a portion of a layer of a second conductive material, Barraclough teaches doing so in two distinct steps, not in a single step. *See*, for example, Barraclough at col. 3, ll. 40-42, which discloses use of different etchants for the various material layers. Indeed, based on this disclosure, Barraclough teaches away from etching plural conductive layers in a single step. Accordingly, it cannot be said that Barraclough teaches or renders obvious Applicants’ claimed process. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this basis for rejection.

4. Claim 19 Is Patentable Over Barraclough

Claim 19 recites, among other limitations, the steps of “depositing a layer of a first conductive material onto a first surface of a substrate; depositing a layer of a second conductive material onto a second surface of said substrate; . . . *perforating said substrate at a*

*predetermined location; and electrically coupling said layer of a first conductive material with said layer of a second conductive material via said perforation”* (emphasis added). The examiner has indicated that Barraclough teaches or renders obvious this combination of process steps. The examiner, however, has not expressly applied Barraclough to this claim or otherwise indicated the manner in which Barraclough discloses or renders obvious the foregoing combination of elements. Applicants submit that Barraclough does not do so.

Barraclough is directed to a process for forming thin-film circuit devices, for example, resistors. Barraclough discloses depositing a layer of conductive material on a first surface of a substrate, depositing another layer of conductive material on the foregoing layer of conductive material, and etching such layers to yield such a device. Nowhere does Barraclough teach or even suggest depositing a layer of conductive material on a second surface of the substrate, perforating a substrate, or electrically coupling two layers of conductive material on opposite sides of a substrate by way of a perforation in the substrate. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this basis for rejection.

##### 5. Claims 35-43 Are Definite

The examiner has rejected these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 on the ground that it is unclear whether the “interfacial layer” and “intermediary layer” recited therein are the same layers or different layers. Applicants submit that the “interfacial layer” and “intermediary layer” are in fact different layers. The intermediary layer is a layer that may be disposed between the recited “said surface of a substrate” and the recited “layer of a first conductive material.” The interfacial layer is a layer that may be disposed between the recited “layer of a first conductive material” and the recited “layer of a second conductive material.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this basis for rejection.

6. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration thereof.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Mark P. Vrla  
Registration No. 43,973

Dated: April 30, 2007

**JENNER & BLOCK LLP**  
330 North Wabash Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60611  
Telephone No: (312) 222-9350  
Facsimile No: (312) 527-0484